



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE HISTORIANS' HISTORY OF THE WORLD<sup>1</sup>

### VOL. I, PART II, EGYPT

The writer has furnished a rather extensive sketch of Egyptian history, popularly written, not without literary merits. In opposition to the proud title, he expressly disclaims to speak as an authority and gives, on p. 53, a list of eleven authorities, "with additional citations" of thirty-eight more, including the Holy Bible, the Turin Papyrus, and the dynastic lists of Karnak, Abydos, and Saggarah, Herodotus, John Maundeville, Thomas Young, etc. The key to authorities states "that it is in one sense of the word a compilation, but it is a compilation of unique character . . . made up of direct quotations from authorities." I doubt whether this plan is "so novel" as the editor claims; there are enough old and new examples of such compilations; nor is it unique to mark the quotations (hardly as extensively as the introduction seems to claim) by a characteristic "superior letter" or another printer's mark.

Needless to say that such a compilation, even if made very skillfully and by an expert, is not for the scholar, who will rather go to the (best!) authorities themselves. Furthermore, it is, in general, an absolute impossibility for a layman to make such a compilation correctly, at least for early oriental history. A skilful critic may succeed with certain periods where the sources are generally the same for every historian, where a certain canon of tradition exists, and certain modern authorities are generally recognized, so that the specialist will alter or add only small details. In oriental (and especially in ancient Egyptian) history there is, and must be, an immense difference of opinion, owing to scanty and problematic material. Then the rapid progress of such a young science as Egyptology, in which frequently one newly discovered stone alters several chapters of history, is to be considered. Consequently, only a perfect "outsider" can undertake it to compile works of such a different character and age as those enumerated as "authorities" in our book. It is true, the case is not so bad as it would seem from that enumeration. Fortunately, I cannot find that Bunsen (who is described as a popular writer—has the author really read his "popular" book?) or Chabas has been used, nor Lepsius (which book?). In reality, only four or five books

<sup>1</sup> *The Historians' History of the World*. Vols. I and II. New York: The Outlook Co., 1905. Pp. 637+666.

are traceable, among which E. Meyer's popular *Geschichte Aegyptens* is very prominent; but these books are sufficiently contradictory. The claim of the author, that the casual reader might scan chapter after chapter without suspecting that the whole is not the work of a single writer, does not count on very attentive readers. I am afraid even a very ordinary reader must stumble over such incongruities as that the name of the queen, spelled usually by our writer *Hatshepsu*, appears, on p. 135, as *Hatshepsitu*; that Egypt is called *Qem* (p. 119; a very, very old error) or (after Maspero) *Kamit* (but never, as far as I can see, in the correct form *Kêmet*). He must observe the chronological contradictions, p. 174 and p. 179, due to the confusion of different personalities named Shoshenk, etc. A more attentive reader will notice that the synopsis (pp. 68-76), the interspersed chronological tables, and the detailed narrative are taken each one from a different book, written by different authors, at different ages, and containing very different views, which the purely *mechanical* compilation has overlooked. Indeed, the book is a useful illustration that such a compilation is impossible for the non-Egyptologist.

It may seem to some that slips are pardonable in the case of a popular book which bears the modest motto *prius placendum quam docendum*, (not quite in agreement with its haughty title) and that the scholars, among whom so very few can write popularly, ought to judge mildly the errors of an outsider. I am, however, of the opinion that nowhere more care is required than in popularizing, that the general public has a right to receive only the best and most secure results of investigation, and that the popularized error involves an enormous responsibility. Therefore it is regrettable, that this book, published in 1904, follows, by preference, antiquated sources. With exception of a note (p. 89), it does not notice the fact that, beginning with 1896 (de Morgan's first book) the earliest history of Egypt, anterior to the Fourth Dynasty, has been so wonderfully illuminated by many recent discoveries. On p. 97 it still treats the late wooden sarcophagus of Mycerinus as contemporary with that king; on p. 108, etc., it insists on the first voyage to Punt in the Eleventh Dynasty (we can now trace these expeditions down to the Fifth Dynasty); likewise, the most important expeditions of the pharaohs of the Sixth Dynasty into the interior of Africa are not mentioned. The hypothesis of p. 105 has for a long time been retracted by its author. On p. 114 the Moeris lake is still treated as a reservoir; Amenophis IV is still a eunuch on p. 139; the alleged Syrian "Arisu" still reigns on p. 167; Brugsch's Hittite fancies still survive on p. 137, etc.; and so on. Errors

as that on p. 139 (captives "sacrificed" to a god) may spread much confusion among laymen; similarly on p. 129, etc.; or bold hypotheses, as on p. 162, "the mixed population of Ethiopians and Assyrians." We may pardon the fancy (pp. 163, 164) of an enormous Libyan empire, although it has no monumental foundation whatever, but to call northern Africa "the Sudan" is a slip which will provoke the criticism of any newspaper-reader. The curiosity of ethnologists may be aroused by the discovery of "dark Berber races" (the Berbers—i. e., Libyans—belong to the best representatives of the Caucasian stock), pp. 124, 203; *lisân* (modern Arabic "tongue!") as an ancient Egyptian word, that of philologists. A full list of corrections is impossible. We need not wonder that the evil spirit of misprinting haunts the book. At the side of many harmless mutilations, such as those of p. 69 (read "User"), p. 76 ("Khabbash"), p. 73 ("Prosopis"), we find, e. g., on p. 113 "boxes" (for "ibexes"); on p. 168 even *Tyrians* attacking Egypt and 169 occupying Italy. Of course, *Tyrrenians*, *Tyrsenians*, are meant! How many sources of the most contagious error flow here! I admire the courage of the writer, but, e. g., where he gives (pp. 295 ff.) an alleged synopsis of Egyptological literature, passing strange judgments on various Egyptologists, his boldness becomes objectionable, I fear.

Professor Erman, of Berlin, is mentioned as "contributor and editorial reviser." The few general remarks "written specially for the present work" (p. 67) make Erman appear, indeed, as somewhat responsible, but the initiated will easily see that he cannot possibly have revised the work and indorsed some of its views. It would be interesting to know Erman's feelings on his appearing as responsible, e. g., for the chapter on hieroglyphics.

I repeat: The plan and execution betray the uninitiated, and, notwithstanding the literary ability of the author, the book serves as a good evidence that a history of Egypt can be written only by an Egyptologist, at least at the present time.

The illustrations have abandoned the now prevailing method of authentic reproductions and have resumed the old style of freely composing pictures. The results are very sad. The artist blunders terribly in every respect—in anthropologic type, costume, and ornamentation—and yet has the enviable boldness of stating, under the most absurd pictures, "based on the monuments" (e. g., p. 103), or "from a statue" (e. g., p. 112). These illustrations are, perhaps, the most objectionable feature of the well-intending book.

W. MAX MÜLLER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

## VOL. I, PART III, MESOPOTAMIA

The portion of this work devoted to Mesopotamia occupies pp. 305-638 of the first volume. On the whole, *The Historians' History of the World* gives a fair picture of Babylonian and Assyrian life and culture. It also acquaints the general reader with some of the vexed problems which have caused so much discussion among Assyriologists. The editors have made an effort to present in adequate form a good account of the marvelous civilization which originated in Babylonia, and have done well to devote much space to the civilization, the art, the science, etc., of this fascinating land, thereby redeeming their pages from the aridity of a political chronicle. The method of compilation which the editors follow may in some historical fields work successfully, but in the case of Babylonia and Assyria, where most of our reliable information has been acquired in comparatively recent times through the decipherment of inscriptions, and where much new and epoch-making information is coming to light every year, the method presents grave difficulties to one not an Assyriologist; and it cannot be said that the work of the editors has escaped the consequences of these difficulties.

This portion of the history opens with an introductory essay, written especially for this work, on the "Relation of Babylonia with Other Semitic Countries," by Halévy, the father and doughty champion of the anti-Sumerian theory. This essay sets forth the author's well-known views, although in the rest of the history the Sumerian theory is presupposed. The editor, however, informs the reader of the reasons for this seeming discrepancy. An outline of Mesopotamian history, devoted largely to chronology, follows the introductory essay. This chronology is based upon that of Rogers in Vol. I of his *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, supplemented in the earlier portions from Radau. The editors are to be commended for adhering to this longer chronology, and for not being beguiled by Lehmann and his followers into an endeavor to rob Babylonian development of perspective by the abolition of a thousand years.

The successive chapters deal with the following subjects: (1) "Land and People;" (2) "Old Babylonian History;" (3) "The Rise of Assyria;" (4) "Four Generations of Assyrian Greatness" (an account of the Sargonide dynasty); (5) "The Decline and Fall of Assyria;" (6) "Renascent and Fall of Babylon;" (7) "Manners and Customs of Babylonia-Assyria;" (8) "The Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians;" (9) "Babylonian and Assyrian Culture." Two appendices follow, the first of which contains the "Classical Traditions" concerning the Assyrians and Baby-

lonians, and the second, an account of the "Excavations in Mesopotamia and Their Results."

The historians from whom this work is compiled are Herodotus, Berossus, Diodorus Siculus, and Strabo, of the ancients; and Weber, Meyer, Budge, Sayce, Winckler, Babelon, Tiele, Oppert, Rogers, Radau, Fox Talbot, George Smith, Hommel, Maspéro, Layard, Heeren, Ménant, King, Pinches, Williams; and for the discoveries, Rogers, Rassam, Layard, de Sarzec, Peters, and Hilprecht.

The chapters on the political history are, for the most part, good, presenting the reader with a satisfactory view of the course of events. The later chapters, on the manners, customs, art, and religion, are much less satisfactory. In this part of the work too much space is given to classical authors and too little to the vast amount of information which has come to us through Babylonian business documents. One could find no fault at quotations from Herodotus, if they were kept within bounds; for just those features which would strike an acute foreign observer are those which we should be likely to miss in the native sources. The case is different, however, when, as here, later Greek writers are drawn upon at length, and but three quotations are made from contract tablets. These quotations are made from a work of Ménant published in 1880, notwithstanding the fact that the greatest progress in the interpretation of these documents has been made within the last fifteen years by Peiser and others! The pages of this history would have been greatly enriched had the customs of marriage, divorce, alimony, adoption, co-partnership, etc., been illustrated, as they might have been, from the contract literature. A knowledge of recent literature would also have preserved the editors from some errors. For example, it is stated on p. 494 that "in spite of differences in property and wealth, interest is always the same." As a matter of fact, the rate of interest varied, as in modern times, in proportion to the satisfactory nature of the security given. (Cf. *Assyrian and Babylonian Literature*, Aldine ed., pp. 265, 266, where three loans are translated, in one of which the rate of interest was  $11\frac{1}{3}$  per cent., in another,  $13\frac{1}{3}$  per cent., and in the third, 20 per cent.) Again, considering the late date of the book of Daniel it hardly seems right to quote it, as on p. 485, as an authority on Babylonian customs.

On the other hand, the utilization of the Code of Hammurabi, which is given in a fairly good translation, is worthy of all commendation, though, owing to a defect in the key at the end of the book, we are left in ignorance as to who the translator is. The editors tell us that by referring to this key one can always ascertain whose work is quoted, but this table does

not tell us who the translator of this code in chap. 7 is, just as it does not tell us who *e* and *f* of chap. 1 are. This key was compiled with too little care.

Again, in treating of the religion of the Babylonians, the editors have overlooked the latest and best work. They quote from Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures* of 1887—a work never good, and long since outdated—and pass by Jastrow's book altogether.

The work is well printed, but not free from typographical errors. De Sarzec's name is misspelled on pp. 535 and 544, though properly spelled on pp. 610 ff.

#### VOL. II, PART VII, MEDIA AND PERSIA

Part VII of *The Historians' History* Vol. II, pp. 555–666, is devoted to ancient Persia, the account of which necessarily includes Media. The subjects of the different chapters are as follows: (1) "The Land and People;" (2) "The Median or Scythian Empire;" (3) "The Early Achæmenians and the Elamites: Cyrus and Cambyases;" (4) "The Persian Dynasty: Darius I to Darius III;" and (5) "Persian Civilization." The authorities quoted for these chapters are, of the ancients, Herodotus, Xenophon, Ctesias, Berossus, Strabo, Polyænus, and Xanthus; and of the moderns, Meyer, Duncker, Nöldeke, Sayce, Rogers, Floigl, Maspéro, Rawlinson, Prášek, Heeren, Morier, and R. K. Porter.

The method of compilation strikes one as producing here some curious results, as when a critical reconstruction of Nöldeke's is injected into the midst of quotations from Herodotus; but, on the whole, the resulting history of Media and Persia is much more satisfactory than that of Babylonia and Assyria. Perhaps this is in part due to the fact that we are much more dependent for Persian history upon the Greek writers for which our editors have a predilection than in the case of Babylonia and Assyria. The editors have, however, availed themselves of the results of the study of inscriptions, and recognize that, in the light of the monuments under the researches of critical study, the idea of a Median empire, as it used to be entertained, must be abandoned.

The work is illustrated with frequent pictures, but neither in the case of Mesopotamia nor in that of Persia are the illustrations particularly happy, nor are they as well executed as they should be in these days of good, inexpensive illustrations.

On the whole, however, one not a specialist would get from this work an interesting and tolerably correct picture of the history and life of these ancient lands.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR, PA.

## VOL. II, PART IV, ISRAEL

The second volume of *The Historians' History of the World* begins with Israel. The plan is the same as in the rest of the work; a number of "authorities" are chosen and allowed to speak for themselves, each being represented by a citation of considerable length. There is a preliminary essay taken from Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*; then we have a chapter from the hand of Professor Cheyne, entitled "A Critical Survey of the Scope and Sources of Israelitic History to the Destruction of Jerusalem;" next comes an outline, covering in brief the ground to be gone over; and only after all this preliminary do we come to the history proper. As a sample of the method used in the body of the work we may take chap. 2, entitled "Origin and Early History." At the start the editor remarks that some of the greatest of living scholars are able to separate their ideas into two classes, "and to entertain two seemingly antagonistic sets of judgments regarding the entire subject of Hebrew history." This comfortable assurance is illustrated by a quotation from Professor Sayce. The state of mind there revealed is unfortunately well known to us, but it seems to be a queer way to begin a history—thus to assure the reader that leading scholars are of two minds regarding the subject they profess to treat.

The chapter goes on to give us some knowledge, or rather opinion in a summary of Löhr's chapter on the patriarchs, the climax of which is reached in an interesting quotation from Goethe. Then the labor is undone by the information that Stade (an authority in the best sense of the word) takes a far less confiding view of Israelite tradition, and we are confirmed in this opinion of Stade by an extended citation from his own work; this citation undoubtedly gives a clear presentation of the critical view, but we are thrown into perplexity when we find it followed without remark by a biblical mosaic, made up from Exodus and Deuteronomy. After this, we return to Stade and read his account of the state of Canaan before the conquest. The conquest itself, however, is recounted in the words of Ménard, who seems to be dependent on Reuss and Kuenen. The chapter concludes with a citation from the biblical book of Judges which gives the program of the compiler of that book—a very late author, as is well known. What clear or connected impression the reader will get from this chapter is difficult to see.

It is, indeed, interesting to notice the perfect illustration of Hebrew literary methods given by the compiler of this work. When the higher critics pointed out that the Hebrew books in our hands were made by dovetailing together previously existing documents, they were met with



incredulity, not to say derision. It was generally held that no sensible man would or could make a book in this way. Yet here we have a modern scholar who can find no better way in which to give us what he supposes to be worth knowing about the history of the world, than the very method used by the biblical authors. Whether the method was suggested to him by what the higher critics have brought to light we do not know; the identity of method is equally striking if there was no conscious borrowing.

It is fair to say, however, that we have a right to test this work by a different standard from the one we apply to writers of twenty-five centuries ago. The compiler would no doubt wish his work to be judged by the highest standard. In fact, the prospectus of the publishers invites the severest scrutiny by its claim of accuracy, conciseness, and clearness. It is in the matter of accuracy and consistency that a compilatory work like this is apt to fall short. The difficulties met by the editor in fitting together his various sources must have been enormous. That he has not succeeded fully in overcoming the difficulties will be clear on examination. When we read that the most famous peaks of Palestine are "the hills about Jerusalem—Zion, Moriah, and the Mount of Olives," we very much fear that the unlearned reader will get the idea that Zion and Moriah are hills outside of Jerusalem, instead of the ones on which the city is built. A little way from the above we read of "the snowy peaks of Hermon, whence the sons of God came down to join themselves under the shade of the great cedars with the daughters of men. After the lapse of many centuries this marriage of heaven and earth was destined to be renewed in a chaster form, and Eden and Galilee to see bloom like a lily under green palm trees the new Eve, the Virgin who should bear a God." The editor does not give a reference for this passage, and we are led to conjecture that it sprang into being from his own love of fine writing. As a part of an historical work it is open to objection on almost every score. The comparison of the incarnation to the lusts of the angels is in bad taste; the biblical account of the mingling of the angels with the daughters of men says nothing of Hermon, so that the reference has no excuse for being; as to history, of course a talmudic whim has no place in our sources; how Eden and Galilee saw Mary under green palm trees passes the imagination of man. These criticisms may betray a prosaic soul, but we are dealing with a work of history which should be prose and not poetry.

The compiler tells us that "the Hebrews after their migration and throughout their subsequent history were firmly imbued with some essen-

tially Egyptian ideas. They alone of ancient peoples (other than the Egyptians) practiced a circumcision. It is at least an open question whether the Hebrew belief in the immortality of the soul was not gained through contact with the people of the Nile. This entire subject, however, is too new and too deeply hedged in by prejudice and preconception to be susceptible of full and satisfactory handling at the present time." We rub our eyes, and ask how such a series of statements comes into a work that purports to give the present results of historical study. The consensus of scholars today is decidedly against there being any appreciable Egyptian influence discoverable in Israel. It is notoriously not true, as is shown by the Bible itself, that the Israelites *alone* (aside from the Egyptians) practiced circumcision. The ideas of immortality which are so prominent a part of Egyptian religion, are in Israel conspicuous only by their absence. Finally, why the whole subject should be "hedged in by prejudice and preconception" is difficult to see. The object of the historian is to dispel prejudice. The matter of Israel's dependence on Egypt is not prejudiced more than a hundred other subjects treated in this book.

A further question arises on comparing different parts of the book with each other. In one chapter the reader is told that the idea of an Amorite kingdom east of the Jordan is a figment of the imagination. In the next he finds it related in apparent seriousness that the Amorites having crossed the Jordan took part of the territory of the Moabites from them. The contradiction is explained, but can hardly be excused, by the fact that we have two statements from different authors. As an example of a more serious contradiction, the curious reader should make a comparative study of the two pictures of David taken respectively from Duncker and from Kittel, and contained in chaps. 4 and 5. They disagree at almost every point. More perplexing still is the discrepancy shown when one reads the discussion of Cheyne with which the book opens, and then proceeds to the body of the work. Cheyne's position is well known. He thinks it possible to discover a text underlying our documents which will revolutionize our ideas of Hebrew history. Egypt will disappear from the documents, and the alleged north Arabian kingdom of Muçri will take its place. Instead of Samaria and the northern kingdom, we shall find localities and tribes of the southern desert. It may be that this theory will finally establish itself. To form an opinion on this point one would have to examine the alleged ancient text underlying our documents. This would far exceed the limits of a book notice. The question with which we have here to do is whether the editor of this

work has a right to perplex his readers by giving them Cheyne to start with, and then to serve up a series of quotations from men who hold another theory, and who scout Cheyne's alleged discoveries. Either Cheyne's theory is true, in which case he ought to write the whole history of Israel; or it is false, in which case he should not be brought in at all in a work not written for specialists.

There are too many typographical errors in the work; the references which are intended to give the reader knowledge of the sources of the work are often too indefinite; serious exception might be taken to the illustrations which in most cases throw no light on the historical situation with which they are connected.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST, MASS.

---

VOL. II, PART V, PHŒNICIA

The name "Phœnicia" is a geographical rather than a national term. It was of varying application, according to the movements and settlements of the "Phœnicians," that is, the ancient inhabitants and colonies of the cities lying along the Mediterranean coast-land between Mount Lebanon and the sea. Any account of the genius and achievements of this remarkable people should be critical and discriminating, for, with the exception of the Babylonians, there is no important people of antiquity about whom such erroneous notions have been maintained.

The present treatise (pp. 243-368 of the volume under review) contains a chronological outline of the history of Phœnicia proper, especially of Tyre from 3800 B. C. to 1516 A. D., and one of Carthage, from 814 B. C. to 697 A. D. The history proper, which follows, contains, in 101 pages, eight chapters, one of which relates entirely to Carthage. Then come an appendix of "Classical Traditions," a reference list of authorities for the several statements that make up the work given by chapters, and a general bibliography.

Prefixed to the whole is a brief extract (in translation) from Pietschmann, setting forth the "Individuality of Phœnician History and Origin of the Name." This is very good indeed, as far as it goes; but it deals with only a few aspects of Phœnician character, and does not fit in very well with any of the sections of the history. An example may illustrate the point. Pietschmann says: "We are only now beginning to put a correct estimate upon the sum of fruitful suggestions and finished products which the Phœnician sea-farers and traders, together with their wares, brought to the nations of the West, and above all to Greek art."

If we seek in the history itself for a treatment of this important subject, we find very little that is appropriate or up to date upon the relations between Phœnician and Hellenic art. (See the vague observations on p. 331; and cf. pp. 335 and 353-55.)

The history, as a whole, although containing many interesting and relevant facts, is scarcely satisfactory. A compilation from many writings, it is quite disproportionate in its treatment of topics equally deserving of mention. Most of its defects are due to the attempt to make a consistent story by piecing it together from the works of authors who wrote from different standpoints and in different times or ages, some of them cautious and discriminating, others credulous and uncritical. The most successful portion is chap. 6, relating to the history of Carthage. Here compilation from recent authoritative works was an easy matter. The most unsatisfactory sections are the discursive paragraphs on civilization and art, where self-restraint was especially demanded.

In a treatise made up as the present has been, frequent mistakes in matters of fact are inevitable; but the number is fewer than one would expect, for the editor evidently has a saving sense both for historic cause and effect and for general chronological accuracy. One mistake of importance is the old error that the island city of Tyre was founded during the blockade of the mainland settlement by Nebuchadnezzar (p. 256). Another is that the alphabet "originated" among the Phœnicians, the Aramæans not being mentioned at all in the discussion (pp. 347 f.), and the remote and problematic "Accadian" being brought in as a possible factor.

#### VOL. II, PART VI, WESTERN ASIA

The chapters on the minor kingdoms of western Asia (pp. 373-468) are specimens of ingenious construction without much regard to the soundness or coherence of the materials. No one who undertakes to bring Hittites, Scythians, Cimmerians, Phrygians, Lycians, Lydians, Carians, Paphlagonians, Aramæans, and Armenians under one general category can write on his theme very instructively. The chief fault of the general treatment is that in the nomenclature no distinction is drawn between districts or countries or races and peoples. There were, properly speaking, no people and no state that were called "Cappadocians" or "Paphlagonians" or "Pisidians." The Roman provinces of Asia Minor were not, as a rule, set off from one another on the basis of racial or political, but of geographical or physical differences, combined with a regard for traditional boundaries, which in their turn had long ceased

to define the limits of ethnical or political separation. The chapter on the Lydians (pp. 422-37) is the best of the four making up the series. That the Aramæans should be placed along with the peoples of Asia Minor (p. 413), according either to the narrow or the wider application of the latter term, is wholly unaccountable. It is possible, however, to write at least about the Aramæans to some good purpose, and the half page devoted to them is a mere trifling with a weighty subject. The "Classical Traditions" (pp. 438-63), however entertaining, are not "history."

J. F. McCURDY.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,  
Toronto.

## EXPOSITORY AND PRACTICAL STUDIES ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST

### XI. TRUE AND FALSE DISCIPLES

MATT. 7: 15-29<sup>1</sup>

#### I. CRITICAL QUESTIONS

Read this passage over and over until you can feel its rhetorical beauty and power. Then review the course of Jesus' argument. His great theme in the sermon on the Mount is the character and life of his disciples. He has spoken of the qualities which they should possess; he has contrasted their spirit with the pride and empty profession of pharisaism; he has exalted simple trust in God and loving service toward men; and now in conclusion he urges the faithful doing of that which he has taught.

#### II. EXPOSITION

Jesus warns his disciples against being led astray by false teachers who appear as wolves in sheep's clothing. They are neither to be victims nor imitators of pious frauds. Whether religious teachers, and men in general, are false or true, may be known by their fruits. Every tree bears fruit according to its own nature, and so do men. Disciples should never be censorious (7:1), but they must have discernment, the motive being to know the right way and not to deal out judgment.

But it is possible for men to deceive themselves. Many may say "Lord, Lord," without having vital fellowship with Christ in doing the will of God. When the kingdom of God fully comes—"that day" of Messiah's reign, hoped for by all Israel—there will be many who have prophesied, cast out devils, and performed mighty works, all in the name of Jesus, but who will be unable to enter with him into his glory, because they have never truly shared his spirit. This does not mean that any who really seek to follow Christ will ever come short of his approval; but it is a serious warning against the half-hearted service and insincerity to which we are all liable.

The shifting emphasis here is very suggestive. It has just been said that we are to know men by their fruits; and now it is implied that men cannot be fully known by their outward works. The two thoughts are supplementary. In one case it is said that conduct is an inevitable expression of the inner life; and in the other, that service to Christ can have worth only as it issues from a right spirit within. What Jesus requires, then, is the

<sup>1</sup> International Sunday School Lesson for April 1, 1906.